

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION**

EDWARD TYRONE RIDLEY,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:20-cv-151 (MTT)
)	
Warden BENJAMIN FORD,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
)	

ORDER

On March 22, 2021, the Court granted the Respondent’s motion to dismiss Petitioner Edward Tyrone Ridley’s petition for a writ of habeas corpus as untimely. Doc. 95. Further, the Court denied a certificate of appealability. *Id.* Ridley now moves for reconsideration but does not explain why he believes reconsideration is appropriate. Nor does his notice of appeal identify what issues he intends to raise on appeal.

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.6, “Motions for Reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice.” M.D. Ga., L.R. 7.6 (emphasis added). Indeed, “[r]econsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly.” *Bingham v. Nelson*, 2010 WL 339806, at *1 (M.D. Ga.) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). It “is appropriate only if the movant demonstrates (1) that there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) that new evidence has been discovered which was not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or (3) that the court made a clear error of law.” *Id.* “In order to demonstrate clear error, the party moving for reconsideration must do more than simply restate [his]

prior arguments, and any arguments which the party inadvertently failed to raise earlier are deemed waived.” *McCoy v. Macon Water Authority*, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D. Ga. 1997). Here, Ridley has not identified any change in the law, newly discovered evidence, or clear error in the Court’s previous Order. Accordingly, his motion for reconsideration (Doc. 97) is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 7th day of June, 2021.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell
MARC T. TREADWELL, CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT